arXiv:1408.4557v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 20 Aug 2014

Fluctuation Effects on the Transport Properties of Unitary Fermi Gases

Boyang Liu,[1] Hui Zhai,[1] and Shizhong Zhang[2]

[1] *Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China*
[2] *Department of Physics and Center of Theoretical and Computational Physics, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

(Dated: August 21, 2014)

In this letter, we investigate the fluctuation effects on the transport properties of unitary Fermi gases in the vicinity of the superfluid transition temperature T_c. Based on the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau formalism of the BEC-BCS crossover, we investigate both the residual resistivity below T_c induced by phase slips and the paraconductivity above T_c due to pair fluctuations. These two effects have been well studied in the weak coupling BCS superconductor, and here we generalize them to the unitary regime of ultracold Fermi gases. We find that while the residual resistivity below T_c increases as one approaches the unitary limit, consistent with recent experiments, the paraconductivity exhibits non-monotonic behavior. Our results can be verified with the recently developed transport apparatus using mesoscopic channels.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Ss,67.85.Lm,67.85.De

In the past decade, one of the most exciting topics in cold atom physics is the unitary Fermi gas characterized by the absence of a small perturbation parameter and strong pairing fluctuations [1–3]. Thermodynamic properties of the unitary Fermi gases have been well studied [4–6] and are shown to be universal [7]. Several experiments have also started to investigate the transport properties of the unitary Fermi gases, including first and second sound [8], shear viscosity [9] and spin diffusion [10–12]. In the later two cases, apparent lower quantum limits have been observed in experiments. Recently, a mesoscopic channel between two bulk unitary Fermi gases has been constructed and a drop of resistance below superfluid transition temperature T_c has been seen [14]. With the same setup, contact resistance [13], quantized conductance [16] and thermoelectric effect [15] have also been observed. These experimental developments offer new opportunities to study mesoscopic transport phenomena with the flexibility of cold atoms.

Historically, fluctuation effects on transport properties have been well studied in the weak coupling superconductors [17]. Two well-known examples in the vicinity of superconducting transition temperature T_c are: (a) Below T_c, a finite resistance appears due to phase slip induced by thermal fluctuations, known as Langer-Ambegaokar-McCumber-Halperin (LAMH) effect [18, 19]; (b) Above T_c, conductivity is enhanced due to Cooper pair fluctuations, often called "paraconductivity" as was first studied by Aslamazov and Larkin [20, 21]. In this Letter, we extend the above calculations to the unitary regime and show how the enhanced pair fluctuation modifies the above two effects. Our main conclusions are:

(i) For the appearance of resistance below T_c, we find that in the unitary regime, the resistivity drops much slower than in the BCS limit as temperature decreases.

(ii) For the enhancement of conductivity above T_c, we find this paraconductivity changes *non-monotonically* from the BCS limit to the unitary regime, and a minimum exists in between.

Time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau Theory. Our derivation is based on the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau (TDGL) theory of BEC-BCS crossover [22]. The partition function of the unitary Fermi gas can be written as $\mathcal{Z} = \int D[\bar{\psi}_\sigma, \psi_\sigma] \exp(-S[\bar{\psi}_\sigma, \psi_\sigma])$, where $S[\bar{\psi}_\sigma, \psi_\sigma] = \int d\tau d^3\mathbf{x}\{\bar{\psi}_\sigma(\partial_\tau - \frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \mu)\psi_\sigma - g\bar{\psi}_\uparrow\bar{\psi}_\downarrow\psi_\downarrow\psi_\uparrow\}$. Here τ is the imaginary time and μ is chemical potential. As usual, g is related to s-wave scattering length a_s by $1/g = -m/(4\pi a_s) + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} 1/(2\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}})$ with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{k}^2/2m$. Introducing Hubbard-Stratonovich fields $\Delta(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ to decouple the interaction term in the Cooper channel and then integrating out the fermions, we obtain an effective theory for the bosonic field $\Delta(\tau, \mathbf{x})$ representing the bosonic Cooper pair field. In the vicinity of T_c where Δ is small, we can expand the action in powers of Δ, as well as its spatial and time derivatives (after Wick rotation),

$$S[\bar{\Delta}, \Delta] = \int dt d^3\mathbf{x}\big\{\bar{\Delta}(\gamma\partial_t - \frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*} - r)\Delta + \frac{b}{2}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\Delta}\Delta\Delta\big\}, \tag{1}$$

where $\gamma = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$ is complex in general. All the parameters γ, m^*, r and b can be expressed in terms of μ, T and $\zeta \equiv 1/(k_F a_s)$ [23]. In the following, we will focus in the vicinity of the superfluid transition temperature, $T \approx T_c$ and as a result, $\mu(T) \approx \mu(T_c)$. We determine both T_c and $\mu(T_c)$ within the Nozières-Schmitt-Rink (NSR) scheme [24].

The real part γ_1 describes the damping of Cooper pairs due to coupling to fermionic quasi-particles. It can be shown that γ_1 is proportional to $\sqrt{\mu}\Theta(\mu)$ [22], where $\Theta(\mu)$ is the Heaviside step function. As a result, around unitarity and in the BCS side where $\mu > 0$, the Cooper pairs have finite life time; while in the BEC limit where $\mu < 0$, $\gamma_1 = 0$ and the Cooper pairs (molecules) are infinitely long-lived within NSR. The imaginary part γ_2

represents a propagating behavior and is given by

$$\gamma_2 = -\mathcal{P}\int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{1-2N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{4\xi_\mathbf{k}^2}, \tag{2}$$

where "$\mathcal{P}$" denotes principle value. $N(\xi_\mathbf{k}) = (\exp(\beta\xi_\mathbf{k})+1)^{-1}$ is the Fermi distribution function and $\xi_\mathbf{k} = \epsilon_\mathbf{k} - \mu$. In the BCS limit $\zeta \to -\infty$, $\mu \gg \Delta$, the integrand is roughly antisymmetric with respect to the Fermi surface $\epsilon_\mathbf{k} = \mu$, a manifestation of particle-hole symmetry of the BCS state. Consequently, $\gamma_2 \simeq 0$. As ζ increases towards the unitarity and the BEC side, γ_2 gradually increases from zero, due to increasing violation of particle-hole symmetry. The behaviors of γ_1 and γ_2 as a function of ζ are shown in the inset of Fig. 1.

Relaxation time. As will be shown later, the relaxation time of the pairing field $\Delta(t,\mathbf{x})$ plays an important role in both the LAMH effect and paraconductivity. In the following, we derive an expression for the relaxation time that is valid close to unitarity. As is known [17], to maintain a non-zero thermal average of the pairing fluctuation, it is necessary to introduce the so-called Langevin force $\eta(t,\mathbf{x})$ into the TDGL equation,

$$-\gamma\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Delta = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*}\Delta - r\Delta + b|\Delta|^2\Delta + \eta(t,\mathbf{x}), \tag{3}$$

where the Langevin force represents the driving force of the environment and is characterized by the "white noise" correlations [17, 25]

$$\langle\eta^*(t,\mathbf{x})\eta(t',\mathbf{x}')\rangle = 2\gamma_1 k_B T\delta(t-t')\delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'). \tag{4}$$

With a straightforward calculation, one finds the correlation function for the order parameter [23]

$$\langle\bar{\Delta}_\mathbf{k}(t)\Delta_\mathbf{k}(0)\rangle = \frac{k_BT}{k^2/2m+|r|}\exp\left[-\Big(\frac{1}{\tau_k}+\frac{1}{i\tau_k'}\Big)t\right], \tag{5}$$

where

$$\tau_k = \frac{\gamma_1^2+\gamma_2^2}{\gamma_1(k^2/2m+|r|)}, \quad \tau_k' = \frac{\gamma_1^2+\gamma_2^2}{\gamma_2(k^2/2m+|r|)}. \tag{6}$$

τ_k represents the temporal decay of the $\mathbf{k}$-th Fourier component of the order parameter, while τ_k' characterizes its propagating behavior. In the limit $\mathbf{k}\to 0$, we obtain

$$\tau_0 = \frac{\gamma_1^2+\gamma_2^2}{\gamma_1|r|}. \tag{7}$$

In the BCS limit $\zeta \to -\infty$, $\gamma_2 \approx 0$ and the relaxation time τ_0 only depends on γ_1 and can be reduced to $\tau_{\rm BCS} = \gamma_1/r$. Furthermore, in the same limit, $\gamma_1 \approx m\beta k_{\rm F}/(16\pi)$, $r \approx mk_{\rm F}(T_{\rm c}-T)/(2\pi^2T_{\rm c})$ [23], as a result, $\tau_{\rm BCS} = \pi/[8k_B(T_c-T)]$, consistent with the weak coupling results [19]. Away from the BCS limit, τ_0 depends on both γ_1 and γ_2. As shown in Fig. 1, as ζ increases from the BCS limit toward the unitary regime, τ_0 first decrease as $\gamma_1/|r|$, and then increases as $\gamma_2^2/(\gamma_1|r|)$. A minimum of τ_0 occurs between the BCS limit and the unitary regime when $\gamma_1 \approx \gamma_2$. In the BEC side when $\mu < 0$, $\tau_k \to \infty$, indicating an undamped bosonic mode. To capture the effect of damping, it is necessary to go beyond the NSR scheme, which we will not attempt here. Rather we focus around unitarity, where our calculation applies.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Relaxation time τ_0 as a function of $\zeta \equiv 1/(k_{\rm F}a_{\rm s})$, in unit of $1/\epsilon_{\rm F}$. Inset: the parameters γ_1/r and γ_2/r as a function of ζ. The temperature of the system is fixed at $1 - T/T_{\rm c} = 10^{-3}$.

Residual resistance below T_c. To simplify our investigation, let us consider the residual resistance of a quasi-one-dimensional unitary Fermi gases of cross-section area A and linear dimension L. The residual resistance below $T_{\rm c}$ is due to the thermally activated phase slips. The net effect of these events is to lower the current of the state, and as a result, a voltage drop must be sustained in order to maintain a steady current [17]. In another words, a finite resistance appears below T_c. Such a theory is developed by LAMH and later confirmed by experiments on BCS superconductors [26].

Within LAMH theory, residual resistivity due to the phase slips is given by [17–19, 23]

$$\rho(T \lesssim T_{\rm c}) = \frac{2\pi A\Omega}{Lk_BT}\exp\left[-\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_BT}\right]. \tag{8}$$

ΔF_0 is the lowest free-energy barrier to create one phase slip. Its analytic expression was derived by Langer and Ambegaokar: $\Delta F_0 = \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{3}\frac{r^2}{2b}A\xi$, where $r^2/2b$ is the condensation energy density and $\xi = 1/\sqrt{2m^*|r|}$ is the Ginzburg-Landau coherence length. ΔF_0 is roughly the condensation energy in a volume $A\xi$. Ω is the so-called "attempt frequency", originally derived by McCumber and Halperin [19] as $\Omega = \frac{L}{\xi}\sqrt{\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_BT}}\frac{1}{\tau_{\rm BCS}}$. In our case the relaxation time $\tau_{\rm BCS}$ has to be replaced by τ_0 derived above.

Let us first investigate the dependence of ρ on the interaction parameter ζ. To do that, we first fix the tem-



FIG. 2. (Color online) (a) Resistivity (and in the inset $\Delta F_0/k_BT$) as a function of the coupling $1/k_Fa_s$ with the temperature below T_c by $(T_c-T)/T_c = 5\times10^{-3}$. (b) Resistivity as a function of temperature. The curves "a" and "b" correspond to two different scattering lengths in marked in (a). Here we take $k_F^2A = 10^6$.

perature below T_c by $1-T/T_c = 5\times10^{-3}$. Then it is clear from Eq. 19, the resistivity depends on several ratios $\Delta F_0/k_BT$, $v_F^{-1}T\xi$ and $\epsilon_F\tau_0$. Within our calculation, $\epsilon_F\tau_0$ changes only by a factor of $3\sim4$ from BCS to the unitary regime. On the other hand, if one uses the weak coupling expression for $\xi = v_F/\pi\Delta$ and the fact that $T\approx T_c\sim\Delta$ the parameter $v_F^{-1}T\xi$ then remains almost a constant. Numerical calculation shows that in the regime of ζ considered, $v_F^{-1}T\xi$ changes only a few percent; see inset of Fig.3 (a). Now, the most important dependence is on $\Delta F_0/k_BT$, since it appears on the exponential factor. Detailed calculation shows that $\Delta F_0/k_BT$ changes by a factor about $3\sim4$ in the relevant regime; see inset of Fig.2(a). Taking into account all these dependences, we find that from the BCS side to unitarity, the fluctuation induced residual resistivity increases rapidly by several orders of magnitude, as shown in Fig.2.

Now let us look at the temperature dependences of the residual resistivity. In Fig.2 (b), we plot the resistivity ρ in the BCS limit ($\zeta=-3$) and at unitarity ($\zeta=0$), normalized to their respective values ρ^* at $1-T/T_c = 1.5\times10^{-3}$. We observe that as temperature decreases, the resistivity drops much slower at unitarity than in the BCS limit. We also note that in Fig. 2 (b), there is a unusual drop of resistivity (marked by the dashed lines) when temperature is very close to T_c. This is because the LAMH theory fails very close to T_c [21].

The above two observations at unitarity, the increased residual resistivity and its slower decrease as a function of temperature, suggest the more pronounced role of superconducting fluctuations below T_c at unitarity in comparison with the BCS limit. The increase of resistivity is monotonic as one approaches unitarity from the BCS side, in accordance with our general expectations. In fact, as was discovered recently, close to unitarity when $A/\xi^2 \gg 1$, the energetically more favorable defects is a solitonic vortex [27–29], instead of the phase soliton in the BCS regime where $A/\xi^2 \lesssim 1$. Thus our estimation of ΔF_0 is an overestimate of the defect energy and the residual resistivity should in fact increase more rapidly close to unitarity and decrease even slower as the temperature is lowered. However, when we turn to the fluctuation induced conductivity above T_c, as we shall show shortly, the effect is not monotonic and in fact exhibits a minimum in between.

Enhanced Conductivity above T_c. Above T_c, in addition to the usual conductivity given by normal fermions, there will be an extra contribution to conductivity due to thermal fluctuation of Cooper pairs field $\Delta(x,t)$, known as paraconductivity. We introduce the fluctuating supercurrent $J(t)$ along one of spatial direction, say, $\hat{x}$, where $J_x(t)$ is given by $J_x(t) = \frac{1}{m^*}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} k_x|\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)|^2$. The fluctuation induced paraconductivity can be directly calculated using the Kubo formalism as

$$\sigma_{xx}(\omega) = \frac{1}{k_BT}\int_0^\infty dt\langle J_x(t)J_x(0)\rangle\cos(\omega t). \qquad (9)$$

A straightforward calculation yields the current-current correlation function as [17, 25]

$$\langle J_x(t)J_x(0)\rangle = \left(\frac{1}{m^*}\right)^2\sum_{\mathbf{k}} k_x^2|\langle\bar{\Delta}_{\mathbf{k}}(t)\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}(0)\rangle|^2. \qquad (10)$$

While $\langle\Delta\rangle = 0$ for $T > T_c$, the thermal fluctuation of Cooper pair field $\Delta(t,\mathbf{x})$ renders a non-zero value of the time-correlation function $\langle\bar{\Delta}_{\mathbf{k}}(t)\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}(0)\rangle$, as found previously in Eq. (5). This yields a non-zero contribution to the conductivity above T_c,

$$\sigma_{xx}(\omega) = \frac{1}{k_BTm^{*2}}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\left[\frac{k_xk_BT}{k^2/2m^*+|r|}\right]^2\frac{\tau_k/2}{1+(\tau_k\omega/2)^2}. \qquad (11)$$

We note that only τ_k, which characterize the temporary decay of the order parameter correlation function, contributes to the conductivity. Specializing to the quasi-one-dimensional and considering the DC component $\sigma_0 \equiv$



FIG. 3. (Color online) (a) The fluctuation induced paraconductivity as a function of the coupling $1/(k_F a_s)$ with the temperature above T_c by $(T-T_c)/T_c = 10^{-3}$. (b) The fluctuation induced paraconductivity as a function of temperature. Curves marked by "a", "b" and "c" correspond to three different scattering lengths marked in (a). Here we take $k_F^2 A = 10^6$.

$\sigma(\omega = 0)$, the paraconductivity can be written as

$$\sigma_0 = 2k_B T\tau_0 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dk_x}{2\pi} \frac{k_x^2\xi^4}{A(k^2\xi^2+1)^3} = \frac{k_B T\xi}{8A}\tau_0, \quad (12)$$

with τ_0 given by Eq.(7). To see how σ_0 changes as a function of interaction strength ζ, let us fix the temperature slightly above T_c, $1-T/T_c = 10^{-3}$. As we show in Fig. 3 (a), as one goes from the BCS limit to the unitary regime, fluctuation induced paraconductivity first decreases and then increases, in comparison with the monotonic behavior of phase slip induced resistivity below T_c. The similar dependence on ζ of σ_0 and the relaxation time τ_0 can be understood in the following way. According to Eq.12, σ_0 is proportional to τ_0 with the coefficient $T\xi$. Now, as we have shown before, since again $T \sim T_c \sim \Delta$, $T\xi$ remains approximately a constant and as a result, σ_0 exhibits qualitatively the same dependence on ζ as τ_0.

Now, let us look at the temperature dependences of σ_0 for various values of ζ. In Fig. 3 (b), we show σ_0 at three interaction strengths: $\zeta = -3$ (marked by a), $\zeta = -0.5$ (marked by b) which is at the minimal of σ_0 and $\zeta = 0.3$ (marked by c). They all show rapid increase as one approaches T_c from above.

Discussions. In this work we have discussed fluctuation effects on the transport properties of the unitary Fermi gas based on TDGL theory. At present, our results cannot be directly applied to the BEC limit since we have not taken properly into account the interactions between molecules. This leads to the infinite lifetime in the BEC side of the crossover where $\mu < 0$. Furthermore, in the BEC limit, it is also important to take into account the correction to chemical potential arising from the molecular interaction. We shall leave this to a future investigation.

In recent ETH experiment they have observed drop of the resistance for unitary Fermi gas below T_c, but the drop is much slower compared with typical BCS superconductor [14], consistent with our findings, although their experimental situation is much complicated than what is discussed here. Namely, the finite resistance observed below T_c is due to the thermally activated phase slips which becomes much easier when close to unitarity, reflecting its enhanced superconducting fluctuations. Furthermore, we find that fluctuation induced conductivity (paraconductivity) above T_c exhibits non-monotonic behavior as one approaches unitarity from the BCS side. This can be verified in the same ETH experimental setup.

Acknowledgements. BY and HZ are supported by Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program, NSFC Grant No. 11174176, and NKBRSFC under Grant No. 2011CB921500. SZ is supported by the startup fund from the University of Hong Kong and collaborative research fund HKUST3/CRF/13G. HZ would like to thank Hong Kong University for hospitality where part of this work is finished.

[1] S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1215 (2008).
[2] W. Zwerger Ed., *BCS-BEC Crossover and the Unitary Fermi Gas*, Spinger, 2012.
[3] E. Taylor, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 023612 (2009).
[4] M. Horikoshi, S. Nakajima, M. Ueda, T. Mukaiyama, Science **327**, 442 (2010).
[5] S. Nascimbène, N. Navon, K. J. Jiang, F. Chevy, C. Salomon, Nature **463**, 1057 (2010).
[6] M. J. H. Ku, A. T. Sommer, L. W. Cheuk, and M. W. Zwierlein, Science **335**, 563 (2012).
[7] T. L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 090402 (2004).
[8] L. A. Sidorenkov, M. K. Tey, R. Grimm, Y.-H. Hou, L. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Nature, **498** 78 (2013).
[9] C. Cao, E. Elliott, J. Joseph, H. Wu, J. Petricka, T. Schäfer, J. E. Thomas, Science **331**, 58 (2011).
[10] A. Sommer, M. Ku, G. Roati, and M. W. Zwierlein, Nature **472**, 201 (2011).
[11] M. Koschorreck, D. Pertot, E. Vogt, and M. Kohl, Nat Phys **9**, 1 (2013).
[12] A. B. Bardon, S. Beattie, C. Luciuk, W. Cairncross, D. Fine, N. S. Cheng, G. J. A. Edge, E. Taylor, S. Zhang, S.

Trotzky, and J. H. Thywissen, Science **344**, 722 (2014).
[13] J.-P. Brantut, J. Meineke, D. Stadler, S. Krinner, T. Esslinger, Science **337**, 1069 (2012).
[14] D. Stadler , S. Krinner, J. Meineke, J.-P. Brantut, and T, Esslinger, Nature **491**, 736 (2012).
[15] J.-P. Brantut, C. Grenier, J. Meineke, D. Stadler, S. Krinner, C. Kollath, T. Esslinger, and A. Georges, Science **342**, 713 (2013).
[16] S. Krinner, D. Stadler, D. Husmann, J.-P. Brantut, and T. Esslinger, arXiv:1404.6400 (2014).
[17] M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*, chapter 8, 2nd edition, Dover Publications (2004).
[18] J. S. Langer, and V. Ambegaokar, Phys. Rev. **164**, 498 (1967).
[19] D. E. McCumber, and B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **1**, 1054 (1970).
[20] L. G. Aslamazov, and A. I. Larkin, Phys. Lett. **26A**, 238 (1968).
[21] W. J. Skocpol, and M. Tinkham, Rep. Prog. Phys. **38**, 1049 (1975).
[22] C. A. R. Sá de Melo, M. Randeria, and J. R. Engelbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3202 (1993).
[23] See supplementary materials for a brief derivation of the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau equation and the expression for various parameters in it, and a brief review of the LAMH theory.
[24] P. Nozières, and S. Schmitt-Rink, J. Low Temp. Phys. **59**, 195 (1985).
[25] A. Larkin, and A. Varlamov, *Theory of Fluctuations in Superconductors*, Oxford University Press, 2005.
[26] R. S. Newbower, M. R. Beasley, and M. Tinkham, Phys. Rev. B **5**, 864 (1972).
[27] T. Yefsah, A. T. Sommer, M. J. H. Ku, L. W. Cheuk, W. Ji, W. S. Bakr, and M. W. Zwierlein, Nature **499**, 426 (2014).
[28] M. J. H. Ku, W. Ji, B. Mukherjee, E. Guardado-Sanchez, L. W. Cheuk, T. Yefsah, and M. W. Zwierlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 065301 (2014).
[29] A. Bulgac, M. M. Forbes, M. M. Kelley, K. J. Roche, and G. Wlazowski, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 025301 (2014).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau theory of BEC-BCS crossover

A time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau theory can be constructed for the entire BEC-BCS crossover close to $T_{\rm c}$ [1]. The partition function takes the form $\mathcal{Z}=\int D[\bar{\psi}_\sigma,\psi_\sigma]e^{-S[\bar{\psi}_\sigma,\psi_\sigma]}$, with

$$S[\bar{\psi}_\sigma,\psi_\sigma]=\int d\tau d^3\mathbf{x}\Big\{\bar{\psi}_\sigma(\partial_\tau-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m}-\mu)\psi_\sigma-g\bar{\psi}_\uparrow\bar{\psi}_\downarrow\psi_\downarrow\psi_\uparrow\Big\}, \tag{1}$$

where ψ_σ are Grassman fields and g is the contact interaction between fermions of opposite spins. μ is the chemical potential which is determined by requiring the number density to be equal to n. To investigate the fluctuation effects in the Cooper channel, we use Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation to decouple the interaction term in the Cooper channel and then integrating out the fermions. We obtain an effective theory for the bosonic field $\Delta(\tau,\mathbf{x})$, which represents the cooper pair field. Straightforward calculations yield the partition function of field Δ as

$$\mathcal{Z}=\int D(\bar{\Delta},\Delta)\exp\Big[-\frac{1}{g}\int d\tau d\mathbf{x}|\Delta|^2+\ln\det\hat{G}^{-1}\Big], \tag{2}$$

where

$$\hat{G}^{-1}=\begin{pmatrix}-\partial_\tau+\frac{\nabla^2}{2m}+\mu & \Delta\\ \bar{\Delta} & -\partial_\tau-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m}-\mu\end{pmatrix} \tag{3}$$

is the Gor'kov Green function.

In the vicinity of the phase transition the gap parameter Δ is small and an expansion in terms of Δ becomes possible. Including both the spatial and time derivatives (after Wick rotation) and retaining the parameter Δ up to the forth order we obtain an effective action as

$$S[\bar{\Delta},\Delta]=\int dtd^3\mathbf{x}\Big\{\bar{\Delta}\big[\gamma\partial_t-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*}-r\big]\Delta+\frac{b}{2}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\Delta}\Delta\Delta\Big\}, \tag{4}$$

where $\gamma = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$ and all the parameters can be expressed in terms of microscopic parameters as

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{m^{3/2}}{8\sqrt{2}\pi}\beta\sqrt{\mu}\Theta(2\mu), \tag{5}$$

$$\gamma_2 = -\mathcal{P}\int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{1-2N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{4\xi_\mathbf{k}^2}, \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{1}{2m^*} = \frac{1}{2m}\int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\left\{\frac{1-2N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{8\xi_\mathbf{k}^2} + \frac{\frac{\partial N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{\partial \xi_\mathbf{k}}}{4\xi_\mathbf{k}} + \frac{\frac{\partial^2 N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{\partial \xi_\mathbf{k}^2}\cdot\frac{\mathbf{k}^2}{2m}}{6\xi_\mathbf{k}}\right\}, \tag{7}$$

$$r = \frac{m}{4\pi a} + \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\left\{\frac{1-2N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{2\xi_\mathbf{k}} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon_\mathbf{k}}\right\}, \tag{8}$$

$$b = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\left\{\frac{1-2N(\xi_\mathbf{k})}{4\xi_\mathbf{k}^3} + \frac{\beta N(\xi_\mathbf{k})[N(\xi_\mathbf{k})-1]}{2\xi_\mathbf{k}^2}\right\}. \tag{9}$$

In above equation $N(\xi_\mathbf{k}) = 1/(\exp(\beta\xi_\mathbf{k})+1)$ is the Fermi distribution function and $\xi_\mathbf{k} = \epsilon_\mathbf{k} - \mu$ with $\epsilon_\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}^2/2m$. Function $\Theta(2\mu)$ is the heaviside step function. Notation "$\mathcal{P}$" in equation of γ_2 denotes the principle value. Explicitly, the parameter b is the result of loop calculation with four fermion propagators

$$b = -\frac{1}{\beta^2}\sum_{\omega_n}\int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{1}{(-i\omega_n + k^2/2m - \mu)^2}\frac{1}{(i\omega_n + k^2/2m - \mu)^2}. \tag{10}$$

The other parameters γ_1, γ_2, $\frac{1}{2m^*}$ and r are all derived from the inverse vertex function $\Gamma^{-1}(\omega_n, \mathbf{k})$, which after the standard renormalization which replace g with the two-body scattering length a_s, is given by

$$\Gamma^{-1}(\omega_n, \mathbf{k}) = -\frac{m}{4\pi a_s} - \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3}\left\{\frac{1-N(\epsilon_\mathbf{k}-\mu)-N(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}-\mu)}{-i\omega_n + \epsilon_\mathbf{k} + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}} - 2\mu} - \frac{1}{2\epsilon_\mathbf{k}}\right\}. \tag{11}$$

To derive the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau equation, we first analytically continue vertex function to real frequency $i\omega_n \to \omega + i0^+$. This procedure generates a time-dependent term with parameter $\gamma = \gamma_1 + i\gamma_2$. The γ_2 term exhibits a propagating behavior. As long as $\mu > 0$, γ_1 is nonzero, which indicates a finite lifetime of the Cooper pairs.

Three important quantities that characterize the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau theory are relaxation time, coherence length and condensation energy. The variation of the relaxation time as a function of $\zeta \equiv 1/k_F a_s$ is illustrated in Fig. 1 of the main text. Here we plot the variations of the coherence length and condensation energy with respect to $1/k_F a_s$. In BCS and BEC limits all the parameters can be analytically derived as shown in Table I.



FIG. 1. The coherence length and condensation energy as functions of $1/k_F a_s$.

Using the asymptotic expressions above we can derive a Gross-Pitaevski equation from Eq. (4) at BEC limit. By defining $\Psi = \sqrt{|\gamma_2|}\Delta$ we obtain

$$-i\partial_t\Psi - \frac{\nabla^2}{2M}\Psi - \tilde{\mu}\Psi + U|\Psi|^2\Psi = 0. \tag{12}$$

Parameters	BCS limit	BEC limit
γ_1	$\nu(\epsilon_F)\cdot\frac{\pi}{8k_BT}$	0
γ_2	0	$-\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{8\sqrt{\epsilon_F\|\mu\|}}$
$\frac{1}{2m^*}$	$\frac{1}{2m}\cdot\frac{7\nu(\epsilon_F)\epsilon_F}{12\pi^2(k_BT)^2}\zeta(3)$	$\frac{1}{2m}\cdot\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{16\sqrt{\epsilon_F\|\mu\|}}$
r	$\nu(\epsilon_F)\ln\frac{T_c}{T}$	$\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\epsilon_F}}\cdot(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}a_s}-\sqrt{2\|\mu\|})$
b	$\frac{7\nu(\epsilon_F)}{8\pi^2(k_BT)^2}\cdot\zeta(3)$	$\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{32\sqrt{\epsilon_F}\|\mu\|^{3/2}}$

TABLE I. Asymptotic behaviors of the parameters in the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau theory in the BCS and BEC limits.

The parameters in above equation can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2M}&=\frac{1}{2m^*|\gamma_2|}=\frac{1}{2m}\cdot\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{16\sqrt{\epsilon_F|\mu|}}\cdot\frac{8\sqrt{\epsilon_F|\mu|}}{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}=\frac{1}{4m},\\
\tilde{\mu}&=\frac{r}{|\gamma_2|}=\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\epsilon_F}}\cdot(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}a_s}-\sqrt{2|\mu|})\cdot\frac{8\sqrt{\epsilon_F|\mu|}}{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}\approx 0,\\
U&=\frac{b}{\gamma_2^2}=\frac{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}{32\sqrt{\epsilon_F}|\mu|^{3/2}}\cdot\Big(\frac{8\sqrt{\epsilon_F|\mu|}}{\pi\nu(\epsilon_F)}\Big)^2=\frac{4\pi a_b}{M},
\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

where the boson mass $M=2m$, the binding energy $E_b=1/(ma_s^2)$ and the boson scattering length $a_b=2a_s$.

Langer-Ambegaokar-McCumber-Halperin theory

In this part we give a simple derivation of the Langer-Ambegaokar-McCumber-Halperin theory [2]. We start our analysis from the static Ginzburg-Landau free energy functional

$$F=\int d^3\mathbf{x}\Big\{\bar{\Delta}\big[-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*}-r\big]\Delta+\frac{b}{2}\bar{\Delta}\bar{\Delta}\Delta\Delta\Big\}.\tag{14}$$

Minimizing the free energy with respect to the field Δ yields the time-independent Ginzburg-Landau equation $-\frac{\nabla^2}{2m^*}\Delta-r\Delta+b|\Delta|^2\Delta$. For a neutral system the current density is written as $J=\frac{1}{2m^*i}[\bar{\Delta}\nabla\Delta-\Delta\nabla\bar{\Delta}]$. A uniform constant-current solution of the 1D Ginzburg-Landau equation can be written as $\Delta_k=f_k\exp(ikx)$ with $f_k^2=(r-k^2/2m^*)/b$, where k is the allowed wave vector along the x direction with periodic boundary condition $\Delta(0)=\Delta(L)$. L is the length of the 1D tunnel. The current density subject to the solution of $\Delta_k=f_k\exp(ikx)$ is $J=\frac{k(r-k^2/2m^*)}{m^*b}$. This current has a maximum value $J_c=(2r/3)^{3/2}/\sqrt{m}b$ at $k_c=\sqrt{2mr/3}$.

For $J<J_c$, the stead state is that of a persistent current without any dissipation. According to the Josephson relation, this corresponds to a definite phase twisting between the two ends of the superconducting wire. Close to T_c, thermal fluctuations can either add or remove one more twist by 2π in the wire, with an free energy barrier ΔF_0 that is determined by Langer and Ambegaokar [3]. In the presence of supercurrent, there is now a difference between the free energy barriers between the adding (ΔF_+) or removing (ΔF_-) of an extra 2π-twist, which is given by

$$\delta F\equiv\Delta F_+-\Delta F_-=2\pi AJ,\tag{15}$$

where A is the cross-section area of the 1D channel. The prefactor Ω is the attempt frequency as discussed in the main text. As a result, the rate of phase decreasing by 2π is slightly larger than the one of phase increasing by 2π. The changing of phase difference between two ends per unit time is

$$\frac{d\phi_{12}}{dt}=\Omega\left[\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_BT}+\frac{\delta F}{2k_BT}\right)-\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_BT}-\frac{\delta F}{2k_BT}\right)\right]\tag{16}$$

$$=2\Omega\sinh\left(\frac{\delta F}{2k_BT}\right)\exp\left[-\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_BT}\right],\tag{17}$$

where ϕ_{12} is the difference between the order parameter phases at the two ends of the channel. A steady current state can be achieved when a small chemical potential difference $\Delta\mu$ is applied on the ends of the wire. The resistivity can

then be defined as

$$\rho \equiv \frac{\Delta\mu}{LJ} = \frac{2\Omega}{LJ} \sinh\left(\frac{\delta F}{2k_B T}\right) \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_B T}\right]. \tag{18}$$

For small current the resistivity can be approximated as

$$\rho \simeq \frac{2\pi\Omega A}{L k_B T} \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta F_0}{k_B T}\right]. \tag{19}$$

[1] C. A. R. Sá de Melo, M. Randeria, and J. R. Engelbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3202 (1993).
[2] M. Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*, chapter 8, 2nd edition, Dover Publications (2004).
[3] J. S. Langer, and V. Ambegaokar, Phys. Rev. **164**, 498 (1967).